



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and itching hands, eager to snatch away from us our glittering treasure. "We must protect the Philippines!" From whom? Tell us who wants the Philippines? Nobody. They are a white elephant which can be left out over night with safety. Nobody will take them. They are one of the heaviest burdens this nation has ever tried to lift. They have been a drain on us from the day we bought them. They would be a millstone around the neck of any nation. We could afford to pay to-day any nation a hundred million dollars to take them off our hands, and then we should be a gainer by the bargain. To spend hundreds of millions in protecting a thing which nobody wants — only men driven delirious by brooding always on war are capable of such grotesque and unfathomable stupidity.

5. "To keep the peace we must prepare for war." Some one said that long ago, and men have repeated it as though it were a word from the mouth of God. Its hollowness is evident to any one who will look into it. The fact is that to keep the peace we must prepare for peace. If you want war, then prepare for war, multiply your guns, burnish them and make them shine, practice with them, keep the air filled with the reverberations of the roar of cannon. Swing your fleet from one ocean to another just when hearts are most irritated. Fill your newspapers with accounts of what your ships are doing, crowd your magazines with pictures of torpedo boats and destroyers. Set all the young men of the country thinking and talking about war, and then some day war will come. It is inevitable! If a nation does not want to fight it must put up its sword. It is amazing that there is an intelligent man on the earth who cannot see this.

6. "Our race is a fighting race. Men have always fought, therefore they always will fight, at least for ages yet to come. The process of evolution is slow. International action has always been selfish, it always will be selfish. Washington said: 'It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another. It has been so, and must be so forever.' For generations, then, wars may be confidently expected. Preparedness is therefore a national duty." The nomenclature of all this is modern, but this method of argument is primitive. A man who argues thus has a mind which works exactly like the mind of a South Sea Islander. The islander had always been a cannibal, his parents had been cannibals, and his grandparents and all his ancestors back for hundreds of thousands of years. He said: "We have always eaten people, and therefore we always will. Our tribe has always been selfish, and it always will be. I propose to keep my knife sharp." Poor islander! he argued thus because he had never heard of Christ. Then one day he heard of him, and he quit eating people, and then his whole tribe quit, and a little later on all the tribes of the island quit, and nobody on the island ever thinks nowadays of eating human flesh any more. Men that tell us that what men have been they must always be, and that what nations have done they must always do, argue up to their light, but they do not possess much, and should the world follow them it will find itself in a ditch.

7. "But is not this whole business a matter for the military experts? Who are you that you should set yourself above the Naval Board or call in question the conclusions reached by men who have given their whole life to military problems?" The answer is that the

military experts are entirely out of their province as soon as they begin to deal with problems of statesmanship. The naval policy of a nation is a question of statesmanship, and the two indispensable qualifications in those who deal with it are spiritual insight and wide historical knowledge. It is for naval experts to determine how thick the steel plates ought to be, and how far a shell can be thrown, and how fast a steel ship can be driven, and what sort of fortification will render the most effective resistance; but on all questions of national policy they should have no more to say than any other equally competent set of men. It is because the nations of the Old World have given themselves so largely to the guidance of military experts that modern civilization finds itself so handicapped and plagued. Military and naval boards have never said but one thing, and that is, "More, more, more!" They see everything through the bore of a gun. There are many men in the American navy who are able in intellect and noble in character, and of whom the nation has a right to be proud, but their education has been technical, their range of experience has been narrow, and their labors have not fitted them to deal with the high and difficult problems of internationalism. It is high time we were listening to our scholars and merchants, our statesmen and prophets, to the men of wide observation and far vision, who, knowing what has been and able to interpret what now is, are best qualified to work out policies which will hold the republic true to her high destiny, and safeguard her from the perils by which so many empires have been overwhelmed.

The Great British Nation Frightened of a Ghost!

BY DR. ROBERT SPENCE WATSON.

[The author of this appeal to the English Liberals is one of the most eminent citizens of England. He has himself personally and alone successfully arbitrated more than one hundred labor disputes. Since the death of Sir Joseph Pease he has been president of the British Peace Society.—ED.]

We Englishmen have some extraordinary peculiarities; at all events, for the last fifty years we have lived on constantly recurring naval scares. We have always had the largest navy, generally as large or as powerful as those of any other two nations — often larger, but scares take no notice of facts. We never think that we are specially liable to be frightened of other people. We sing that —

"We ne'er see our foes but we wish them to stay;
They never see us but they wish us away."

We boast of how in war our great admirals never counted the odds, and yet our aim is to be able to crush any possible antagonist by simple preponderance of numbers, weight and gun power. We hear constantly that our naval defenses (or offenses) are insufficient. Some naval expert who has, happily, not got his knowledge from actual warfare, declares that we were never so badly prepared to face some imaginary foe. Then there is a scare, not generally amongst the bulk of common-sense people, but started by this expert and his *confrères* and gradually caught up by society, which is not a little dependent for its strange power upon the Services. Away go all prudence and all good, economical resolves, and money is poured out like water. In most of these

cases there is a pretense of something actually existing which we hold to give a kind of backing to the scare. It used to be the French who were doing such and such dreadful things, increasing their navy in some surreptitious manner, bent on destroying the naval power of England. Now we have transferred this to the Germans. There is no reason for this. There is not the slightest proof that Germany desires more than to hold her own. There is abundant proof that whatever Germany is doing, we have compelled her to do by our own action. But though it is not true, it gives a pretense or a pretext for the scare. We ourselves have, by starting a new kind of battleship, the "Dreadnought," thrown down the challenge to the world. So far as other peoples are concerned, we are confronted simply by a ghost. They have done nothing but talk. Our fear arises from nothing. We have laid down the spending of huge sums of money over a number of years. But then we are told, "Ah, yes, but look at what Germany proposes to do!" We do not ask how and when the means of carrying out her proposals will be in her hands. They are merely on paper, and we must therefore abandon all idea of reduction of armaments or any question of expense. We did think of such things two years ago. We seemed to believe that the waste of wealth upon that which creates nothing might be stopped by a sensible and fair agreement between nations. But there has been the Hague Conference since then. Upon the one question upon which all other nations were agreed we refused to meet them, and to abandon the right of capturing private property at sea during war, and this avowedly because we have the greatest number of ships to do this particular kind of stealing, apparently forgetting that we have also the greatest number of merchantmen which can be stolen, and of which other peoples may rob us. As we would give nothing whatever up, we can hardly expect that we can get our neighbors, who are avowedly in the matter of navies weaker than we are, to believe much that it was actually an honest declaration on our part, that we desired the reduction of the armaments of the world.

But the Great British nation frightened of a ghost! Let us see in a word what this means:

At the present time we have seventy-five battleships and armored cruisers against forty-one possessed by France and Germany. We are called upon to go on building "Dreadnoughts," the largest of all. As we have built one "Dreadnought," and as we have announced our intention of going on building others during the next twelve years, until we shall have at the end of the time eighteen ships equal to our present "Dreadnought," Germany, France, America, and other nations, think that they must go and do likewise so far as they can. It is quite true that the "Dreadnought" will be superseded as every other battleship has been, and that the day will come when it has to be thrown on to the scrap-heap. That is nothing to our naval experts. It is the nation's money which is being wasted. But now the Germans, of whom we seem to be peculiarly afraid for no reason whatever, have laid down a program that in the same length of time they will build nine ships equal to our "Dreadnought." So that, at the end of the time, we shall have eighteen of these big ships to Germany's nine, and this is without counting at all the great num-

ber of ships we have now which are not yet on the scrap-heap, but good active ships. If we take these into account we find that, at the present time, we have not only a double superiority to Germany alone, but we have sixty-two battleships and armored cruisers against fifty-one which Germany and France have; or, to put it in another way, sixty-one against seventeen which Germany has.

Of course, now that the "Dreadnought" has been launched and is carrying defiance to all other peoples, we shall be told that we must count in Dreadnoughts only, but this is not reasonable. I do not want to enlarge upon this matter. It has been admirably treated in a pamphlet containing three articles, by Mr. Massingham and Mr. Morgan Browne, and in the valuable circular signed by Sir John Brunner, M.P., and Mr. J. A. Murray Macdonald, M. P., entitled "The Liberal Party and the Estimates: a Statement and Appeal." But I do wish most strongly to bring before such members of the Liberal Party as I can reach the fact that all this is absolutely contrary to what we have always professed. In this matter we are doing the work of the Tory Party, and the dirty work of the Tory Party. We are deeply pledged by our Members of Parliament from the Prime Minister downwards to the reduction of expenses upon armaments. Here the cry is enormously to increase them, and the whole of this money is to be got, not from an ideal reservoir of wealth, the State, but the people themselves. That only means we are to pay for this waste. The poorest are to be taxed for these ships, and the taxes fall far the most heavily upon those who can least afford them. It will be an iniquity if we give way upon this matter. It is not one to be argued about; it is one to be fought to the very end. It is no use pretending that we will save a little here and save a little there. We want the money which we are going to throw away over battleships and over their guns and ammunition. We want it for good, useful and most important purposes, and we ought to see that our members carry out that which they have led us to expect.

BENSHAM GROVE, GATESHEAD,
February 20, 1908.

Safety of the Republic Does Not Lie in Professional Soldiers Trained to Kill.

In a recent speech in the House of Representatives, when the Army Appropriation Bill was under consideration, General Isaac R. Sherwood of the Toledo (Ohio) District, said:

"Let us not fail to note that all the great students and scholars and humanitarians on both sides of the Atlantic are to-day for peace and arbitration. The ethical movement of the age is against standing armies and big navies. No man of heart or capable thought believes that a big army and navy are messengers of peace. Even an ordinary dog fancier knows better. He knows that peace among the canine tribe would never be promoted if every man should breed and train a fighting bulldog. And the dogs of war, whether canine or human, are just the same. [Applause and laughter.]

"The commerce of peace has wings of white, and her